

# IDEA Advisory Meeting

## MINUTES

DECEMBER 10, 2015 9:00 – 4:15 P.M.

COUNTRY SUITES, BISMARCK

MEETING CALLED BY	Shannon Grave, Vice Chairperson
TYPE OF MEETING	IDEA Advisory Meeting
FACILITATOR	Gerry Teevens
NOTE TAKER	Michelle Souther
ATTENDEES	Gerry Teevens, Michelle Souther, Robin Tschider, Colette Fleck, Mathew McCleary, Kim Cowell, Mary McCarvel-O'Connor, Emmanuel Mensah, Shannon Grave, Matt Strinden, Patti Redding, Valerie Bakken, Jacki Harasym, Ed Boger, Debra Huber, Leona Zemliska, Susan Wagner, Dr. Patti Mahar, Brenda Ruehl, Susan Gerenz, Nancy Jo Burke, Melissa Deckert, Robert Parisien, Lucy Fredericks

## Agenda topics

REVIEW OF SPP/APR INDICATORS

SUSAN WAGNER

DISCUSSION	<p>States are required by law to submit an Annual Performance Report every year to the federal government on the 20 indicators. North Dakota's most recent SPP and APR reports can be found here: <a href="https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/8152">https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/8152</a></p> <p>North Dakota's most recent OSEP Response Table and Determination Letter can be found here: <a href="http://www2.ed.gov/fund/data/report/idea/partbspap/allyears.html">http://www2.ed.gov/fund/data/report/idea/partbspap/allyears.html</a></p> <p>North Dakota did not meet the target on these indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicator 1 -Graduation,</li> <li>Indicator 6b LRE Preschool Separate Classroom/School</li> <li>Indicator 11, Timely Evaluation Rate</li> <li>Indicator 12 Preschool Transition and</li> <li>Indicator 13 Transition Planning by Age 16</li> </ul> <p>Indicator 1: Graduation Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. North Dakota did not meet this target. Students with disabilities in North Dakota can stay in school until they are 21. The target for Indicator 1 is 89%. North Dakota's rate for 14-15 was 69.51%. Those least likely to graduate are those students served in separate classroom, resource room, ID, SLD, OHI.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. North Dakota met this target. North Dakota's rate for this target for 14-15 was 18.76%. The target is 19.50% for this indicator. The target is set to go to 17% in 2018-19.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading. North Dakota met this target. The 3b target is 95%. In spring 2015, a new regular assessment and new alternate assessment for the 1% was administered. No 2% test were administered. Most likely to score proficient in reading is students placed in regular classroom – students with VI, OI, Autism, and ED students, white and Asian students, grades 3 &amp; 4 and not on free and reduced meals. Least likely to score proficient are students in resource room or separate classroom, ID, SLD, OHI, African American and Native American students, grade 11 and students on free and reduced lunch. The 3C target is 100%.</p> <p>Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion Rate: Rate of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. North Dakota met the target for Indicator 4. Indicator 4B is the rate of suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity. North Dakota met the target for Indicator 4B. The target for 4a is .97%.The target for 4b is set by OSEP and has to be 0%.</p> <p>Indicator 5: LRE for students – percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served. North Dakota met the target. The target for 5A is 75.20%. The target for 5B is 4.85%. The target for 5C is 2.00% for 2015-16. Susan Wagner suggested that maybe look at the mobility of students including those moving in from another state for this indicator.</p>
------------	---

Committee Member Patti Redding said she has fought to keep her child in the regular classroom. She doesn't know if it is because their school is small and rural.

Indicator 6: LRE for Preschool Students – Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending. Valerie Bakken explained that every state has a different understanding of definition of the regular education environment which might explain why we are one of the lowest. The target for 6A for 2018-19 is 29.60% from 27.50% for 2015-16%. The target for 6B is 28.60% for 2015-16 to 26.50% for 2018-19. There is not a lot of regular education head starts or preschool or early childhood programs in the state.

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. Indicator 7 data comes from ND Early Childhood Outcomes Summary form from Tienet. The target for 7A1 was 83.50% and 7A2 63% for 2014-15. The target for 2018-19 7A1 is set for 84.50% and 7A2 at 64%. North Dakota met this target. The target for 7B is 84% and 7B2 is 55% for 2015-16. The target for 2018-19 is 7B is 85% and 7B2 is 56%. The target for 7C for 2015-16 is 80.50% for 7C2 is 72%. The target for 2018-19 for 7C is 81.5% and 7C2 is 73%. Last year we assessed 741 students. Each special education unit will be receiving their district data from the state office. The special education unit will also be able to access this data online.

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement – percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. The parent survey is posted on ND Department of Public Instruction at <https://www.nd.gov/dpi/students-parents/SpecialEducation/special-ed-parentsurvey/>. North Dakota's response rate was 13.4% for 2014-15. The survey is mailed out to parents. North Dakota's percentage for 2014-15 was 70.80%. Target for 2018-19 is set for 73.10% which would be based on the number of parents that report parent satisfaction on the survey. The state would like to get parent's email so we could remind parents that they received a written survey and that if they prefer they could fill out the survey link by email. Parent's email addresses are collected on Powerschool.

**Susan Wagner asked the group to break out in pairs and discuss the following questions:**

**What do you see that's interesting?** African American responses were quite a bit lower with parent satisfaction. Low response rate by parents could mean that they are unsatisfied with the services they are receiving. Robert Parisien is concerned because Standing Rock has a lot of mobility of students and how accurate the data is and what kind of services are they receiving from one school versus another school.

**What additional disaggregation would be helpful to understand the parent involvement?** Breaking this data down by region might be helpful to see if it is just an individual unit or is it statewide issue. 31% of parents would like more communication and updates. What types? What accounts for decrease in parent comfort level in grade 3-5 for ASD, ED, NCD and OHI? Also, by diagnosis/category and scope/type of transition services and related services.

**What are some ideas for increasing response rate?** Kim Cowell suggested that the survey be given by the school at the completion of the IEP meeting. He said that if he had a self-addressed stamped envelope and the survey he could give the survey to the parent after the meeting when parents are more likely to fill it out. A concern is that some parents don't have access to a computer to fill out an online survey. Online and paper or separate room in the school where parents can fill out the survey alone and some kind of an incentive to the parents who fill out the survey (e.g., gift card). Phone surveys by a neutral party could also be tried.

**What are some ideas for improving parent involvement?** Mathew McCleary stated that some parents feel that the educators are dictating the meeting and they are just there with no input. Parents need to be able to feel they can have input and that this is their plan. Melissa Deckert said they have worked with Pathfinder to train their case managers to make sure parents feel like they are part of the team. Letting parents speak first in the IEP meeting might make them more comfortable. Student led IEP meetings – helps prevent the feeling that the meeting isn't all about what the student isn't doing and is more focused on what the student is accomplishing. Sometimes where the meeting is being held – room too small. The IEP meeting can be very overwhelming for parents and students to be in a room with a bunch of educators. Matt Strinden said that parents don't always understand the language the educators are using – they don't know what the acronyms mean so they are sitting in the meeting not understanding what is being said. Parents don't understand what the test scores mean. Brenda Ruehl said that she will give parents the test scores and IEP document before the meeting so that parents can understand what has been given to them so they are more comfortable to ask questions at the meeting. Gerry asked the committee if there were any questions on the Parent Survey that might be confusing for parents. There was a question regarding #1 – Offer training and information that will help me participate fully in the IEP meetings. What do parents consider training? Word change to question #9. – My child's general education teachers make me feel comfortable when I have questions or concerns – change to help me be more comfortable.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation – percent of districts that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate

identification. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. OSEP sets the target for this indicator which is at 0%. In ND, DR is defined as a weighted risk ratio of 3.00 and above based on a target n of 10+ and a comparison group n of 10+.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Category – percent of districts that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. OSEP sets the target for this indicator which is at 0%.

Indicator 11: Evaluation in 60 days – percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days. The data is collected through Tienet. North Dakota did not meet this target. OSEP's target is 100%. This is a compliance indicator so we have to be at 100%. Maybe a lack of a parents knowing the process or not getting to the right person. Brenda Ruehl suggests to parents to put their request for evaluation in writing and give it to the principal. Mathew said sometimes it is a lack of follow thru from the school. Kim Cowell said that they have never not finished the evaluation within the 60 days. The issue is the end of the school year when they get overwhelmed with requests for evaluations. They have change their deadline to help alleviate that issue. Matt Strinden said they have had issues with faxing documents to health care people and paperwork gets lost and that delays the process. They try to be close to the deadline but sometimes due to parent's schedules – both parents working it is hard to meet the deadlines due to parents being unavailable. Melissa Deckert brought up that they have staff shortages – speech language teachers covering 4 or 5 schools so it is hard to get testing done. They start testing student and then the student moves so the evaluation is not finished. Typically units that are found out of compliance is usually because of case manager error.

Indicator 12: Transition from Part C to Part B – percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. North Dakota did not meet this target at 99.17%. The target for this indicator is 100%.

Indicator 13: Transition planning on IEP by age 16 – percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. North Dakota did not meet the target for this indicator. North Dakota's rate was 98.38% for 2014-15. The target is set by OSEP at 100%.

Indicator 14: Post-Secondary Outcomes – percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in post-secondary education/training or employed. North Dakota's rate for 2014-15 was 26.88% for Indicator 14A. The targets for 14A for 2014-15 is 30.09% to 32.39% for 2018-19. North Dakota's rate for 2014-15 was 56.45% for Indicator 14B. The target for 14B for 2014-15 is 56.72% to 59.02% for 2018-19. North Dakota's rate for 2014-15 was 82.26% for Indicator 14C. The target for 14C for 2015-16 is 81.38% to 83.48% for 2018-19. The response rate for this indicator is 25.6%.

**What do you see that interesting?** Committee wondered about the 14% that are currently not working or haven't worked after high school, 8% said that they will lose benefits if they work – how to fix that and the 4% who do not want to work? Incarceration - 0% of students with disabilities – questionable? ND State – concern of freshman that drop out as they just increased the entrance requirements. Colleges are limiting the number of students with disabilities attending by increasing the entrance requirements. Has the oil boom increased the number of students with disabilities living with parents? Students with disabilities can be limited to minimum wage jobs so they can't afford rent.

**What additional disaggregation would be helpful to understand the post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities?** By region throughout the state

**What are some ideas for increasing response rate:** Getting quality and accurate phone numbers. Students don't care about surveys. Students don't know that this report is the only evidence the state has to make decisions. How do you survey students living in a group home? Can service providers help get those surveys completed? The state would need access to know if a student was living in a group home so would be unable to find the student.

**What are some ideas for improving the post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities?** Mathew McCleary asked if question 16 could be opened up to all students with disabilities instead of just dropouts. Student led IEPs – best practice. Gerry asked the committee if they have any suggestion on how to get accurate phone numbers for students. Right now the state is pulling the data from Tienet. Would the special education units be willing to look over the state's list of phone numbers to verify if they are accurate to the best of their knowledge? Melissa Deckert and Leona Zemliska indicated that their units would assist with this.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions – if states have fewer than 10 they don't have to report the data.

Indicator 16: Mediation - percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements - if states have fewer than 10 they don't have to report the data.

	<p>Indicator 17: State Identified Measurable Results (SIMR) – Target for this indicator for students with ED is 60.22%. The extended rate target for 2018-19 is 66.72%.</p> <p><b>What do you see interesting?</b> Kim Cowell wondered why the ED population was chosen. Gerry explained that the stakeholders group felt that the ED population would encompass students with mental illness which the stakeholders believed was a big issue for the state. This includes behavioral, social-emotional, social communication and/or mental health needs.</p> <p><b>What additional disaggregation would be helpful to understand the ED graduation rate data?</b> Shannon suggested maybe rural vs. urban – rural may not have access to mental health professionals. The variability of diagnosis. A student with anxiety vs a student with a behavioral disorder. Susan said the data is done by district but the committee felt the data by region or rural vs. urban might be useful. Poverty – Free and Reduced lunch -ED – 55% vs. Students with ED not on Free and reduced lunch – 55% - so the data showed that there wasn't a difference.</p> <p><b>What are some ideas for increasing graduation rate for students with an emotional disability?</b> Other promising practices discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build relationships</li> <li>2. Mentor available</li> <li>3. More inclusion in regular education</li> <li>4. Peer support – both youth and parent</li> <li>5. Mental health consultations in schools</li> <li>6. Social-emotional support for preschoolers</li> <li>7. More collaboration with partners and stakeholders</li> </ol> <p>Educators and mental health professionals sometimes have struggles amongst one another - lets work together for the students. Early identification of mental health – schools need to pay attention to the warning signs early. Kim Cowell would like some advice from the professionals on how to help improve graduation rates for these students. Brenda Ruehl thinks it is important to have an advocate at the table. There is no mental health support in the school like there is for other related services. Keep in mind that mental health services are typically done at a clinic and can be expensive with health care copays.</p>	
	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>
		<b>DEADLINE</b>

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION UNIT UPDATES

GERRY TEEVENS

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Susan Gerenz was recently hired by the special education office. The SPDG grant position is still open. Rose Nichols resigned her position as special education grant manager. The 504 portfolio has been moved to the special education unit by DPI Management. The special education office will provide technical assistance and guidance for 504. We are working on updating the 504 website. Robin Tschider will be the lead in the office for 504.</p>
	<p>NCTAT – National Center on Technical Assistance in Transition will provide intensive technical assistance and professional development to: SEA, LEA and VR provides. We were one of three states to receive a grant. The grant will help us increase pre-employment services delivered in cooperation with VR to local districts. Most of the goals will focus on employment. The second goal is to increase the number of work experience opportunities for students at risk and students with disabilities.</p>
	<p>Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) – The CIFR came and provided training to our grant manager and are helping the state create some guidance documents for the units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of Effort (MOE)</li> <li>• Coordinated Early Intervening Services – CFR 300.226</li> <li>• Guidance documents for local units</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tracking tools</li> </ul> <p>We had 220 participants attend the 2015 Secondary Transition Interagency Conference. Melinda Jacobs was a presenter at the conference and was well-received. She discussed a lot of different issues e.g., service animals and transgender issues. Melissa Deckert said it was an excellent conference.</p>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

SLP SHORTAGE TASK FORCE: MEET & GREET  
NDDPI TEACHER SHORTAGES TASK FORCE

MARY MCCARVEL-O'CONNOR

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The SLP task force was created to come up with strategies for recruiting speech teachers for the schools. Mary with the help from the special education units held numerous meet and greets throughout the state. There were 5 different special education units represented at Minot State and 7-8 special education units represented at UND.</p> <p>Minot State – October 26 Moorhead – November 2 UND - November 3</p> <p>DPI Teacher Shortage Task Force – Mary is on the committee to help come up with creative ways to help fill teacher positions. Special Education offers different way to help fill unfilled positions such as Plan on File, Resident Teacher, and Traineeship. General education is trying to come up with similar ideas to recruit teachers. Leona Zemliska said she needs two SLD teachers next year. Leona thanked Mary for the meet and greet because it helped her unit. Peace Garden has one speech-language vacancy. The speech language pool is limited. Fargo discussed the shortage of substitute teachers in their district. One day, Fargo had 14 unfilled positions because of the lack of substitutes. They end up pulling teachers to help cover classrooms. Matt said that in the private schools they have a lot of volunteer parents who apply for their sub teacher license to help cover the need for teachers.</p>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

SPECIAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PLANNING  
PROCESS

KEVIN MCDONOUGH

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>We have posted the SSIP toolkit and FAQ document on our website <a href="https://www.nd.gov/dpi/Educators/SpecialEducation/SpecialEducationImprovementPlanning/">https://www.nd.gov/dpi/Educators/SpecialEducation/SpecialEducationImprovementPlanning/</a>. Some units have started developing their goals. Robin Tschider and Tammy Mayer are also part of the TA Team assisting Kevin with questions from the units. We have received 6 applications for funding. We had a Q &amp;</p>
-------------------	--

	A session with units on November 16 <sup>th</sup> to clarify the process and answer questions. Superintendent Baesler and Assistant Superintendent Bob Marthaller were also present for this session.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

STATE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT  
UPDATE

NANCY JO BURKE

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	We have three REAs that have been active in MTSS – SEEC, MREC, and MDEC. The Federation of Families and Pathfinders work on creating family friendly materials. State Implementation Advisory Team are guiding the work and within that group we have the implementation team which is doing the work and taking it back to the advisory team. The goal is to have an implementation guide by Spring to give to schools.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

VALERIE BAKKEN

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The committee was created to assist North Dakota's Department of Public Instruction with the implementation of new federal policies and/or regulations in the field of Early Childhood Special Education and to discuss and bring attention to current issues pertaining to Early Childhood Special Education in North Dakota. Child Count data – 13,675 students in 2014. Of that 13.3% - 1,823 students ages 3-5.</p> <p><b><u>ND Early Childhood Outcomes Process Anchor Tool List – updated December 2015</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. *Battelle Developmental Inventory - Second Edition (BDI-2)</li> <li>2. *Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC-2)</li> <li>3. *Brigance Inventory of Early Development III (IED-III)</li> <li>4. *Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS) – Second Edition</li> <li>5. *Carolina Curriculum for Preschoolers with Special Needs (CCPSN)</li> <li>6. Psychoeducational Profile – Third Edition (PEP-3)</li> <li>7. *Hawaii Early Learning Profile for Preschoolers (HELP)</li> </ol> <p>Hot Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition process from Part C to Part B</li> <li>• Early Childhood Outcomes entry and exit ratings</li> <li>• Inclusion Policy Statement</li> <li>• Least Restrictive Environment justification</li> <li>• Indicator 6, 7, and 12 data</li> </ul> <p>Save the date – Early Childhood Education Spring Conference – April 14, 2016 at the Radisson in Bismarck ND.</p>
-------------------	--

<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

SPECIAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL MINUTES  
GUIDELINES UPDATE

GERRY TEEVENS

GUIDELINES OF DATE		
DISCUSSION	Questions on an IEP or when the team is determining the number of minutes. The determination of amount of services and time should be on an individual basis. We understand that there is a limitation of speech services or related service providers.	
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
This question is being moved to an agenda item at the upcoming IDEA Advisory meeting in March.		

ESEA UPDATE

GERRY TEEVENS

DISCUSSION	This bill was just signed by President Obama. The new law puts more control into the states and local districts. The department will be looking at the assessments and test that are given. Annual testing will continue for certain grades. Schools will have to use college and career ready standards and intervene when those expectations are not met, but states will be left to design their standards and intervention protocols.		
	New Incentives to improve outcomes:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provides more children access to higher quality programs (250 million in annual funding for preschool funding)</li><li>Funding for program that will scale up evidence-based strategies for improving student outcomes and other incentives that promote innovative reform.</li></ul>		
CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

SUGGESTIONS SUMMARY		
---------------------	--	--

<b>Issues and Concerns in our State:</b> There were no issues brought up by the committee during the meeting.		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<p>The September Minutes were approved by the committee. Ed Boger approved the motion to accept the minutes and Shannon Grave seconded the motion.</p> <p>Public Comment: There was no public comment.</p> <p>The upcoming IDEA Advisory Meetings are scheduled for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• March 10, 2016</li> <li>• June 9, 2016</li> </ul> <p>Agenda Items for March meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Education Instructional Minutes Guidelines Update</li> <li>• New ESEA Updates</li> </ul>		